REMARKS

Claims 1-16 and 18-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). New claim 40 has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-16 and 18-40 are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 3, 14, 21, 22, 33 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 3, 14, 21, 22, 33 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,944,449 to Gandhi *et al.* (hereinafter, "Gandhi") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0165529 to Lee (hereinafter, "Lee") and U.S. Patent No. 5,917,806 to Lin *et al.* Applicants respectfully traverse.

The factual inquiries that are relevant in the determination of obviousness are determining the scope and contents of the prior art, ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue, resolving the level of ordinary skill in the art, and evaluating evidence of secondary consideration. KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. ___, 2007 U.S. LEXIS 4745, at **4-5 (2007) (citing Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966)). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art references "must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." M.P.E.P. § 2142. Moreover, the analysis in support of an obviousness rejection "should be made explicit." KSR, 2007 U.S. LEXIS 4745, at **37. "[R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." Id. (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)).

Claim 1 recites that "the control mechanism used to reduce the load on the base station is selected based on the type and degree of the overload on the base station." Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest this claimed subject matter.

The Examiner correctly acknowledges that "Gandhi does not particularly disclose ... wherein the control mechanism used to reduce the load on the base station is selected based on the type and degree of the overload on the base station." Office Action, page 3.

However, the Examiner asserts that this subject matter is taught by Lee. In particular, the Examiner asserts the following:

> Lee teaches ... [that] the ... overload control process can classify, for example, 24 <u>classes (i.e., types)</u> of overload according to a overload degree and restrict at least one of an originating call and a termination call processed on the basis of each class (p. 0051-0052; Fig. 6).

Office Action, pages 3-4 (emphasis added). Thus, it appears that the Examiner is asserting that the term "class," as used by Lee, means the same thing as the term "type" recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Lee states that "[a]n overload control process can classify ... 24 <u>classes</u> of overload according to the overload <u>degree</u>." Lee, paragraph [0052] (emphasis added). Thus, Lee explicitly indicates that a "class" refers to a "degree" of overload. However, the "degree" of overload is clearly not the same as the "type" of overload, as recited in claim 1. In fact, claim 1 recites "the control mechanism ... is selected based on the <u>type and degree</u> of the overload on the base station." Thus, in claim 1, the terms "type" and "degree" do not mean the same thing.

Lee also states that "to release the overload judgment for the access network, a lowest overload control <u>level</u> (e.g., <u>class</u> '0') should be continuously maintained for a selected time ...." Lee, paragraph [0054] (emphasis added). Thus, Lee indicates that a "class" corresponds to a "level" of overload control. However, a "level" of overload control is clearly not the same as the "type" of overload, as recited in claim 1.

Lee also states that "when the access network is overloaded, a call is discriminately restricted <u>according to a degree of overload</u>." Lee, paragraph [0051] (emphasis added). Lee also states that "the processors ... can flexibly cope with the overload <u>according to the degree of overload</u> and interwork with each other." <u>Id.</u>, paragraph [0067] (emphasis added). Lee also states that "the overload control is discriminately performed <u>according to a degree of overload</u>, so that the overload control method and apparatus can effectively cope with the overload situation and removal." <u>Id.</u>, paragraph [0083] (emphasis added). Thus, although Lee repeatedly refers to "the degree of overload," Lee makes absolutely no mention of the "type" of overload, as recited in claim 1. Lee clearly does not teach or suggest that "the control mechanism ... is selected based on the type ... of the overload on the base station," as recited in claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, and 14 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2, 3, and 14 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in relation to claim 1.

Claim 21 recites "a processor configured to … reduce the load on the base station using a plurality of control mechanisms based on the type and degree of the load on the base station." Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest the use of "control mechanisms based on the type … of the load on the base station," as recited in claim 21.

The Examiner asserts that the subject matter at issue is taught by Lee. See Office Action, page 8. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner cites a portion of Lee that refers to "classes of overload," and it appears that the Examiner is asserting that the term "class," as used by Lee, means the same thing as the term "type" recited in claim 21. However, as argued above, Lee explicitly indicates that a "class" refers to a "degree" of overload. See Lee, paragraph [0052] ("[a]n overload control process can classify … 24 classes of overload according to the overload degree") (emphasis added). Because claim 21 refers to both "the type and degree of the load on the base station," it is clear that the terms "type" and "degree" do not mean the same thing in claim 21. Although Lee repeatedly refers to "the degree of overload," Lee makes absolutely no mention of the "type … of the load on the base station." Lee clearly does not teach or suggest the use of "control mechanisms based on the type … of the load on the base station," as recited in claim 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21 is allowable, and request that the rejection of claim 21 be withdrawn.

Claims 22 and 33 depend from claim 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 22 and 33 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in relation to claim 21.

Claim 39 recites "reducing the load on the base station using a plurality of control mechanisms based on the type and degree of the load on the base station." Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest the use of "control mechanisms based on the type … of the load on the base station," as recited in claim 39.

The Examiner asserts that the subject matter at issue is taught by Lee. See Office Action, page 12. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner cites a portion of Lee that refers to "classes of overload," and it appears that the Examiner is asserting that the term "class," as used

by Lee, means the same thing as the term "type" recited in claim 39. However, as argued above, Lee explicitly indicates that a "class" refers to a "degree" of overload. See Lee, paragraph [0052] ("[a]n overload control process can classify … 24 classes of overload according to the overload degree") (emphasis added). Because claim 39 refers to both "the type and degree of the load on the base station," it is clear that the terms "type" and "degree" do not mean the same thing in claim 39. Although Lee repeatedly refers to "the degree of overload," Lee makes absolutely no mention of the "type … of the load on the base station." Lee clearly does not teach or suggest the use of "control mechanisms based on the type … of the load on the base station," as recited in claim 39. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 39 is allowable, and request that the rejection of claim 39 be withdrawn.

II.   Rejection of Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gandhi in view of Lee, Lin, and U.S. Patent No. 6,442,398 to Padovani et al. (hereinafter, "Padovani"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 10 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 10 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in relation to claim 1.

III.   Rejection of Claims 4, 5, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4, 5, 24, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gandhi in view of Lee, Lin, and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0125068 to Lee et al. (hereinafter, "Lee '068"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 4 and 5 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in relation to claim 1.

Claims 24 and 25 depend from claim 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 24 and 25 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in relation to claim 21.

IV. **Rejection of Claims 7-9 and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 7-9 and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gandhi in view of Lee, Lin, and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0003921 to Laakso *et al.* (hereinafter, "Laakso"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 7-9 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 7-9 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in relation to claim 1.

Claims 26-28 depend from claim 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 26-28 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in relation to claim 21.

V. **Rejection of Claims 12 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 12 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gandhi in view of Lee, Lin, and U.S. Patent No. 6,707,792 to Volftsun *et al.* (hereinafter, "Volftsun"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 12 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 12 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in relation to claim 1.

Claim 30 depends from claim 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 30 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in relation to claim 21.

VI. **Rejection of Claims 13 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 13 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gandhi in view of Lee, Lin, and U.S. Patent No. 6,785,546 to Djuric (hereinafter, "Djuric"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 13 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 13 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in relation to claim 1.

Claim 31 depends from claim 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 31 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in relation to claim 21.

VII. Rejection of Claims 15 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 15 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gandhi in view of Lee, Lin, Laakso, and Djuric. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 15 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in relation to claim 1.

Claim 35 depends from claim 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 35 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in relation to claim 21.

VIII. Rejection of Claims 16 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 16 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gandhi in view of Lee, Lin, Laakso, Djuric, and Padovani. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 16 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 16 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in relation to claim 1.

Claim 36 depends from claim 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 36 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in relation to claim 21.

IX. Rejection of Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gandhi in view of Lee, Lin, and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0155852 to Bender *et al.* (hereinafter, "Bender"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 18 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 18 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in relation to claim 1.

X.   Rejection of Claims 6 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 6 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gandhi in view of Lee, Lin, and U.S. Patent No. 6,134,216 to Gehi *et al.* (hereinafter, "Gehi"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 6 recites that "the control mechanism used to reduce the load on the base station is selected based on the type and degree of the load on the base station." Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest the selection of a "control mechanism … based on the type … of the load on the base station," as recited in claim 6.

The Examiner asserts that the subject matter at issue is taught by Lee. See Office Action, page 29. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner cites a portion of Lee that refers to "classes of overload," and it appears that the Examiner is asserting that the term "class," as used by Lee, means the same thing as the term "type" recited in claim 6. However, as argued above, Lee explicitly indicates that a "class" refers to a "degree" of overload. See Lee, paragraph [0052] ("[a]n overload control process can classify … 24 classes of overload according to the overload degree") (emphasis added). Because claim 6 refers to both "the type and degree of the load on the base station," it is clear that the terms "type" and "degree" do not mean the same thing in claim 6. Although Lee repeatedly refers to "the degree of overload," Lee makes absolutely no mention of the "type … of the load on the base station." Lee clearly does not teach or suggest the selection of a "control mechanism … based on the type … of the load on the base station," as recited in claim 6. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6 is allowable, and request that the rejection of claim 6 be withdrawn.

Claim 23 recites "a processor configured to … reduce the load on the base station using a plurality of control mechanisms based on the type and degree of the load on the base station." Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest the use of "control mechanisms based on the type … of the load on the base station," as recited in claim 23.

The Examiner asserts that the subject matter at issue is taught by Lee. See Office Action, page 32. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner cites a portion of Lee that refers to "classes of overload," and it appears that the Examiner is asserting that the term "class," as used by Lee, means the same thing as the term "type" recited in claim 23. However, as argued above, Lee explicitly indicates that a "class" refers to a "degree" of overload. See Lee, paragraph [0052] ("[a]n overload control process can classify ... 24 classes of overload according to the overload degree") (emphasis added). Because claim 23 refers to both "the type and degree of the load on the base station," it is clear that the terms "type" and "degree" do not mean the same thing in claim 23. Although Lee repeatedly refers to "the degree of overload," Lee makes absolutely no mention of the "type ... of the load on the base station." Lee clearly does not teach or suggest the use of "control mechanisms based on the type ... of the load on the base station," as recited in claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 23 is allowable, and request that the rejection of claim 23 be withdrawn.

XI. Rejection of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gandhi in view of Lee, Lin, Bender, and U.S. Patent No. 6,456,850 to Kim et al. (hereinafter, "Kim"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 19 recites that "the control mechanism used to reduce the load on the base station is selected based on the type and degree of the load on the base station." Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest the selection of a "control mechanism ... based on the type ... of the load on the base station," as recited in claim 19.

The Examiner asserts that the subject matter at issue is taught by Lee. See Office Action, pages 36-37. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner cites a portion of Lee that refers to "classes of overload," and it appears that the Examiner is asserting that the term "class," as used by Lee, means the same thing as the term "type" recited in claim 19. However, as argued above, Lee explicitly indicates that a "class" refers to a "degree" of overload. See Lee, paragraph [0052] ("[a]n overload control process can classify ... 24 classes of overload according to the overload degree") (emphasis added). Because claim 19 refers to both "the type and degree of the load on the base station," it is clear that the terms "type" and "degree" do not

mean the same thing in claim 19. Although Lee repeatedly refers to "the degree of overload," Lee makes absolutely no mention of the "type ... of the load on the base station." Lee clearly does not teach or suggest the selection of a "control mechanism ... based on the type ... of the load on the base station," as recited in claim 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19 is allowable, and request that the rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

XII. Rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gandhi in view of Lee, Bender, Kim, Lin, and U.S. Patent No. 5,949,757 to Katoh *et al.* (hereinafter, "Katoh"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 20 depends from claim 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 20 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in relation to claim 19.

XIII. Rejection of Claims 11 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 11 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gandhi in view of Lee, Volftsun, and Lin. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 11 recites that "the control mechanism used to reduce the load on the base station is selected based on the type and degree of the load on the base station." Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest the selection of a "control mechanism ... based on the type ... of the load on the base station," as recited in claim 11.

The Examiner asserts that the subject matter at issue is taught by Lee. See Office Action, page 41. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner cites a portion of Lee that refers to "classes of overload," and it appears that the Examiner is asserting that the term "class," as used by Lee, means the same thing as the term "type" recited in claim 11. However, as argued above, Lee explicitly indicates that a "class" refers to a "degree" of overload. See Lee, paragraph [0052] ("[a]n overload control process can classify ... 24 classes of overload according to the overload degree") (emphasis added). Because claim 11 refers to both "the type and degree of the load on the base station," it is clear that the terms "type" and "degree" do not mean the same thing in claim 11. Although Lee repeatedly refers to "the degree of overload," Lee makes

absolutely no mention of the "type ... of the load on the base station." Lee clearly does not teach or suggest the selection of a "control mechanism ... based on the type ... of the load on the base station," as recited in claim 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is allowable, and request that the rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn.

Claim 29 recites "a processor configured to ... reduce the load on the base station using a plurality of control mechanisms based on the type and degree of the load on the base station." Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest the use of "control mechanisms based on the type ... of the load on the base station," as recited in claim 29.

The Examiner asserts that the subject matter at issue is taught by Lee. See Office Action, pages 41, 43. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner cites a portion of Lee that refers to "classes of overload," and it appears that the Examiner is asserting that the term "class," as used by Lee, means the same thing as the term "type" recited in claim 29. However, as argued above, Lee explicitly indicates that a "class" refers to a "degree" of overload. See Lee, paragraph [0052] ("[a]n overload control process can classify ... 24 classes of overload according to the overload degree") (emphasis added). Because claim 29 refers to both "the type and degree of the load on the base station," it is clear that the terms "type" and "degree" do not mean the same thing in claim 29. Although Lee repeatedly refers to "the degree of overload," Lee makes absolutely no mention of the "type ... of the load on the base station." Lee clearly does not teach or suggest the use of "control mechanisms based on the type ... of the load on the base station," as recited in claim 29. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 29 is allowable, and request that the rejection of claim 29 be withdrawn.

XIV. Rejection of Claims 32 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 32 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gandhi in view of Lee, Lin, and U.S. Patent No. 5,697,054 to Andersson (hereinafter, "Andersson"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 32 recites "a processor configured to ... reduce the load on the base station using a plurality of control mechanisms based on the type and degree of the load on the base station." Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest the use of "control mechanisms based on the type ... of the load on the base station," as recited in claim 32.

The Examiner asserts that the subject matter at issue is taught by Lee. See Office Action, pages 44-45. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner cites a portion of Lee that refers to "classes of overload," and it appears that the Examiner is asserting that the term "class," as used by Lee, means the same thing as the term "type" recited in claim 32. However, as argued above, Lee explicitly indicates that a "class" refers to a "degree" of overload. See Lee, paragraph [0052] ("[a]n overload control process can classify ... 24 classes of overload according to the overload degree") (emphasis added). Because claim 32 refers to both "the type and degree of the load on the base station," it is clear that the terms "type" and "degree" do not mean the same thing in claim 32. Although Lee repeatedly refers to "the degree of overload," Lee makes absolutely no mention of the "type ... of the load on the base station." Lee clearly does not teach or suggest the use of "control mechanisms based on the type ... of the load on the base station," as recited in claim 32. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 32 is allowable, and request that the rejection of claim 32 be withdrawn.

Claim 34 recites "a processor configured to ... reduce the load on the base station using a plurality of control mechanisms based on the type and degree of the load on the base station." Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest the use of "control mechanisms based on the type ... of the load on the base station," as recited in claim 34.

The Examiner asserts that the subject matter at issue is taught by Lee. See Office Action, page 48. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner cites a portion of Lee that refers to "classes of overload," and it appears that the Examiner is asserting that the term "class," as used by Lee, means the same thing as the term "type" recited in claim 34. However, as argued above, Lee explicitly indicates that a "class" refers to a "degree" of overload. See Lee, paragraph [0052] ("[a]n overload control process can classify ... 24 classes of overload according to the overload degree") (emphasis added). Because claim 34 refers to both "the type and degree of the load on the base station," it is clear that the terms "type" and "degree" do not mean the same thing in claim 34. Although Lee repeatedly refers to "the degree of overload," Lee makes absolutely no mention of the "type ... of the load on the base station." Lee clearly does not teach or suggest the use of "control mechanisms based on the type ... of the load on the base station," as recited in claim 34. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 34 is allowable, and request that the rejection of claim 34 be withdrawn.

XV. Rejection of Claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 37 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gandhi in view of Andersson, Lee, Lin, Laakso, Jang, Cheng and Nagarajan. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 37 recites "a processor configured to ... reduce the load on the base station using a plurality of control mechanisms based on the type and degree of the load on the base station." Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest the use of "control mechanisms based on the type ... of the load on the base station," as recited in claim 37.

The Examiner asserts that the subject matter at issue is taught by Lee. See Office Action, page 51. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner cites a portion of Lee that refers to "classes of overload," and it appears that the Examiner is asserting that the term "class," as used by Lee, means the same thing as the term "type" recited in claim 37. However, as argued above, Lee explicitly indicates that a "class" refers to a "degree" of overload. See Lee, paragraph [0052] ("[a]n overload control process can classify ... 24 classes of overload according to the overload degree") (emphasis added). Because claim 37 refers to both "the type and degree of the load on the base station," it is clear that the terms "type" and "degree" do not mean the same thing in claim 37. Although Lee repeatedly refers to "the degree of overload," Lee makes absolutely no mention of the "type ... of the load on the base station." Lee clearly does not teach or suggest the use of "control mechanisms based on the type ... of the load on the base station," as recited in claim 37. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 37 is allowable, and request that the rejection of claim 37 be withdrawn.

XVI. Rejection of Claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gandhi in view of Andersson, Laakso, Lee, Lin, and Padovani. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 38 depends from claim 37. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 38 be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those presented above in relation to claim 37.

XVII. New Claim 40

New claim 40 has been added. New claim 40 is a computer program product claim corresponding to claim 39. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that new claim 40 is allowable for at least the same reasons as those presented above in relation to claim 39.

XVIII. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. If there are any remaining issues preventing allowance of the pending claims that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Feb. 14, 2008   By: _____/Eric Ho/_____
                                  Eric Ho, Reg. No. 39,711
                                  (858) 658-2752

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 658-2752
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502